

Remarks

In response to the Office Action dated September 19, 2008, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 31-33 and 36-39 and 41 are currently pending. Claims 40 and 42 have been canceled. Claims 31-33 and 36-39 and 41 have been amended. The additional subject matter recited by the claims is supported by the specification such that no new matter has been added. Support for the additional subject matter recited by claims 31, 33, 36 can at least be found in paragraphs 80-86 and figure 8 of the specification. Support for the additional subject matter recited by claims 39 and 41 can at least be found in paragraph 87 of the specification.

Interview Summary

The undersigned participated in a telephone interview with the Examiner on December 18. During the interview it was discussed amending claim 31 to recited the additional feature of providing a list of subscribers associated with a subscription code. Amending claim 39 to recite providing a list of subscription codes based upon a numerical subscription was also discussed. The Examiner stated that a new search would be required.

103 Rejections

Claims 31-33 and 36-38 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Masek (US Pat. 5,272,749) in view of Fleischer (U.S. Pat. 6,411,699). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections. Claims 39-42 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Masek (US Pat. 5,272,749) in view of Fleischer (U.S. Pat. 6,411,699), and further in view of Crocket (US Pat. 5,590,188). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections as they apply to the currently pending claims.

Claims 31 and 32

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Masek and Fleischer fails to describe each of the features recited by claim 31. For example, independent claim 31 recites, in pertinent part, “providing a list of subscribers associated with the subscription code from the look up table,” and “receiving a selection specifying one subscriber that has been selected from the list.” Thus, claim 31 recites the providing of a list of subscribers associated to a subscription code and receiving a selection of a single subscriber selected from the list.

The Office Action contends in the rejection of claims 37-38 that Masek describes a similar feature as recited by claim 31. The Office Action contends that Masek teaches presenting to the caller a list of subscribers associated with the subscription code and receiving one telephone number corresponding to a subscriber that has been chosen by the caller from the list. Applicant respectfully submits that Masek fails to describe such a feature. The Office Action cites col. 10, line 67-col. 11 line 2 as describing this feature. However, the cited location in Masek is completely silent on such a feature. Rather, Masek describes at this location of the disclosure a single number or a sequence of numbers which have a respective name or letter significance as an index into the system’s translation library data table.

Masek does describe the use of translator tables to translate a subscriber created number, such as “CAR CITY,” into a standard assigned telephone number. The translation of one string into another as described by Masek is not analogous to the retrieval of a list of subscribers as recited by claim 31. Thus, Masek fails to describe the retrieval of a list of subscribers associated to a subscription code as recited by claim 31. Since Masek fails to describe retrieving the list of subscribers it follows that Masek fails to describe receiving the selection of a specified subscriber.

Fleischer also fails to describe the providing and receiving features as recited by claim 31. Fleischer is concerned with routing a telephone call according to the geographic location of the calling party. Fleischer describes the selection of a particular destination number from a plurality of numbers based upon the geographic location of the caller. Fleischer does not concern the use of subscription codes and thus fails to describe providing a list of subscribers associated with a subscription code as recited by claim 31.

Fleischer also fails to describe receiving a selection of a specified a subscriber as recited by claim 31. Thus, the combination of Masek and Fleischer fail to describe every feature of claim 31 such that claim 31 is allowable for at least these reasons. Claim 32 depends from claim 31 and is allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 33

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Masek and Fleischer fails to describe each of the features recited by claim 33. For example, independent claim 33 recites, in pertinent part, “offering a selection of two or more subscribers corresponding to the same subscription code,” and “receiving a selection specifying one subscriber selected from the two or more subscribers.” Thus, claim 31 recites the offering of a selection of two or more subscribers corresponding to a subscription code and receiving a selection of a subscriber selected from the two or more subscribers.

The Office Action contends in the rejection of claims 37-38 that Masek describes a similar feature as recited by claim 33. The Office Action contends that Masek teaches presenting to the caller a list of subscribers associated with the subscription code and receiving one telephone number corresponding to a subscriber that has been chosen by the caller from the list. Applicant respectfully submits that Masek fails to describe such a feature. The Office Action cites col. 10, line 67-col. 11 line 2 as describing this feature. However, the cited location in Masek is completely silent on such a feature. Rather, Masek describes a single number or a sequence of numbers which have a respective name or letter significance as an index into the system’s translation library data table.

Masek describes the use of translator tables to translate a subscriber created number, such as “CAR CITY,” into a standard assigned telephone number. Thus, Masek describes the translation of a first character string into a second string. Masek does not describe offering a selection of two or more subscribers corresponding to the same subscription code as recited by claim 33. Masek fails to even describe an operation that would return a selection of two or more subscribers correlated to a particular subscription code, much less offering the selection to a caller. Thus, Masek fails to describe the offering of a selection of subscribers corresponding to a subscription code as recited by claim 33. Masek further fails to describe receiving the selection of a specified subscriber

selected from the two or more subscribers.

Fleischer also fails to describe the offering and receiving features as recited by claim 33. Fleisher is concerned with routing a telephone call according to the geographic location of the calling party. Fleischer describes the selection of a particular destination number from a plurality of numbers based upon the geographic location of the caller. However, Fleischer fails to describe the offering of a selection of subscribers corresponding to a subscription code as recited by claim 33. Fleischer also fails to describe the receiving of the selection of a specified a subscriber that has been selected from the two or more subscribers. Thus, the combination of Masek and Fleischer fail to describe every feature of claim 33 such that claim 33 is allowable for at least these reasons.

Claims 36-38

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Masek and Fleischer fails to describe each of the features recited by claim 36. For example, independent claim 36 recites, in pertinent part, “presenting a list of subscribers associated with the subscription code, wherein the subscription code is associated with two or more different subscribers,” and “receiving a selection specifying one subscriber that has been selected from the list.” Thus, claim 36 recites the presentation of a list of subscribers associated to a subscription code and receiving a single telephone number corresponding to a subscriber that has been selected from the list.

The Office Action contends in the rejection of claims 37-38 that Masek teaches presenting to the caller a list of subscribers associated with the subscription code and receiving one telephone number corresponding to a subscriber that has been chosen by the caller from the list. Applicant respectfully submits that Masek fails to describe such a feature. The Office Action cites col. 10, line 67-col. 11 line 2 as describing this feature. However, the cited location in Masek is completely silent on such a feature. Rather, Masek describes a single number or a sequence of numbers which have a respective name or letter significance as an index into the system’s translation library data table.

Masek describes the use of translator tables to translate a subscriber created number, such as “CAR CITY,” into a standard assigned telephone number. Thus, Masek

describes the translation of a first character string into a second string. Masek does not describe the presentation of a list of subscribers associated to a subscription code as recited by claim 36. Masek fails to describe an operation that would generate a list of subscribers associated to a particular subscription code and thus fails to describe the presentation of a list of subscribers associated to a subscription code as recited by claim 36. Masek further fails to describe receiving the selection of a subscriber that has been selected from the list.

Fleischer also fails to describe the presentation and receiving features as recited by claim 36. Fleischer is concerned with routing a telephone call according to the geographic location of the calling party. Fleischer describes the selection of a particular destination number from a plurality of numbers based upon the geographic location of the caller. Fleischer does not address receiving a subscription code from a caller. Thus, Fleischer fails to describe the presentation of a list of subscribers associated with a subscription code as recited by claim 36. Fleischer also fails to describe the receiving of the selection of a specified subscriber that has been selected from the list. Thus, the combination of Masek and Fleischer fail to describe every feature of claim 36 such that claim 36 is allowable for at least these reasons. Claims 37-38 depend from claim 36 and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claims 39-40

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Masek, Fleischer and Crocket fails to describe each of the features recited by claim 39. For example, independent claim 39 recites, in pertinent part, “generating a list of subscribers based upon the numerical subscription code, wherein the list includes two or more subscribers that are associated with the numerical subscription code,” and “receiving a selection specifying one subscription code selected from the list of subscription codes.” Thus, Claim 39 recites the generation of a list of subscription codes based upon a numerical subscription code and receiving a selected subscription code.

Masek describes a system for translating a subscriber created telephone number to a standard assigned telephone number. Translating a first number into a second number as described by Masek is a one-to-one relationship. Thus, Masek fails to disclose two or

more subscriber codes related to a numerical subscription to base generating a list upon. Therefore, Masek fails to describe generating a list of subscription codes based upon a numerical subscription code as recited by claim 1. Masek also fails to describe receiving a selected subscription code as recited by claim 39. Thus, Masek fails to account for every feature recited by claim 39.

Fleischer and Crocket also fail to account for the noted deficiency. Fleischer describes a system to route a telephone call according to the geographic location of the calling party. The reference does not address subscription codes and does not describe generating a list of subscription codes or receiving a selected subscription code. Crocket concerns the selection of one of a plurality of call centers in a telephone network. However, Crocket also fails to account for the noted deficiency. Thus, the combination of Masek, Fleisher and Crocket fails to account for every feature recited by claim 39. Therefore, claim 39 is allowable over the combination of Masek, Fleischer and Crocket for at least these reasons. Claim 40 depends from claim 39 and is allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 41

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Masek, Fleischer and Crocket fails to describe each of the features recited by claim 41. For example, independent claim 41 recites, in pertinent part, “presenting a list of subscription codes based upon the numerical subscription code,” and “receiving a selected subscription code.” Thus, Claim 41 recites the presentation of a list of subscribers based upon a numerical subscription code and receiving a selected subscription code.

Masek describes a system for translating a subscriber created telephone number to a standard assigned telephone number. Translating a first number into a second number as described by Masek does not involve presenting a list and thus Masek fails to describe presenting a list of subscription codes based upon a numerical subscription code as recited by claim 41. Masek also fails to describe receiving a selected subscription code as recited by claim 41.

Fleischer and Crocket also fail to account for the noted deficiency. Fleischer describes a system to route a telephone call according to the geographic location of the

calling party. The reference does not address subscription codes and does not describe presenting a list of subscription codes or receiving a selected subscription code. Crocket concerns the selection of one of a plurality of call centers in a telephone network. However, Crocket also fails to account for the noted deficiency. Thus, the combination of Masek, Fleisher and Crocket fails to account for every feature recited by claim 41. Therefore, claim 41 is allowable over the combination of Masek, Fleischer and Crocket for at least these reasons.

Conclusion

Applicant asserts that the application including claims 31-33 and 36-39 and 41 are in condition for allowance. Applicant requests reconsideration in view of the amendment and remarks above and further requests that a Notice of Allowability be provided. Should the Examiner have any questions, please contact the undersigned.

No fees are believed due. However, please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 19, 2008

/Daniel J. Layden/

Daniel J. Layden
Reg. No. 60.921

Withers & Keys, LLC
P.O. Box 71355
Marietta, Ga 30007-1355
(770) 643-8912